

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #262
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 27 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 262

Today's Topics:

 ARRL and it's members (4 msgs)
 ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 01:08:36 EDT
From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
wariat.org!nraven!floyd@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:
>
> > First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights
> > as to the ARRL's activities.
>
> That's not neccesarily true. If you're a licensed amateur radio
> operator then the ARRL is helping to set policies that will ultimately
 ^^^^^^
> affect you.
>
>

I guess if you take a loose interpretation you could call it that... again though, it's just the kind of help I don't need! :)

73 de N8VUR

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 01:21:26 EDT
From: noc.near.net!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
wariat.org!nraven!floyd@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

<message deleted>

Ed

I think the ARRL has done good and bad.... The biggest problem is that it looks like we're stuck with a 1 party system. A little competition usually helps both sides improve their quality of service. (The Federal Government is an exception to this rule) Back when Cleveland had both the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press for newspapers, the product delivered was much better than what we pass off as news today in the PD since the Press is long gone. I think a little good old-fashioned competition might just be the answer.

73, 10-4 and all those good numbers. (Sickening, isn't it?!)

73 de N8VUR

Date: 26 Jul 93 14:44:47 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <24i97B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>

>> This whining that the League doesn't represent it's members is the same

>> as people who don't vote whining that congress doesn't represent them either.

>

>I vote, Ron, but I certainly don't pay \$30.00 a year for the privilege!

> --Robert

Odds are you pay that and more if you investigate how much of your tax dollars are used to support the voting process. Regardless, of that, however, the ARRL situation is not unlike many other "special interest" areas. I'm also an classic car enthusiast and must rely on the strength of numbers through one or more organizations to carry my concerns to those that would impact what I can/can't do (legislators, etc.)

Frankly, for the \$30 membership I don't understand the complaints of those that won't join, if only to make their opinions heard. I see hams drop \$30+ all the time for stuff at flea markets, for burgers and brew at club meetings, etc without ever being concerned about the cost. Sure there are some that find the \$30 cost prohibitive, but that's not the great majority of hams, especially when they are so free with their \$30 for other "stuff."

Just my .02.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 26 Jul 1993 12:12 EDT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!
cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <aZNa8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes...

>floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

>

>> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>>

>>

>> <message deleted>

>>

>> Let me get this straight Ron...

>>

>> The League goes out under the premise of representing the entire
>> Amateur Community. But if I don't want them to represent me, I still have
>> to send them \$30 to SUPPORT these ideas of which I wanted no part in the
>> first place????? THEN I can voice my dissent.

>>
>> As the Reverend so beautifully put it: Bullshit.
>
>Now that The League has made it known that they are Internet and Usenet
>connections, I'd like to see THEIR response to this. Enquiring minds want
>to know!
>
> --Robert

Seems that Robert doesn't know how representative democracy works here in the US. When the individual who I supported through elections loses then I have to depend on the winner to represent my interests if not my views. We don't have proportional representation. When an individual wins by 1 vote he represents the whole district and votes aren't split up according to the portion of the individuals voting.

This really means that we as individuals have to make our views known to the representatives who are elected even if we don't vote for them. However, ranting and raving, while cathartic, is not really useful to the rep. An individual must be well informed and not just opinionated. One way to ensure an informed view is through membership and interaction. Given this informed view, make your views known precisely and with a minimum of emotion. Avoid like the plague "ad hominem" arguments. They do nothing but alienate people and complicate the process. Finally, realize that you are always given a chance to make your views known but you will never have a guarantee that they will always be accepted.

There are things with which I disagree with the league. However, on the whole I think that they have struck a fair balance. I'm not sure that I would criticize them for not being on the "bleeding edge" of issues all the time. Sometimes would be nice but it has to be carefully chosen.

Lastly, any organization that depends on volunteer labor should not be castigated when such a volunteer fails to honor a meeting commitment. I'm sure that everyone recognizes that the league does not want this to happen.

Erich
N30XM

Date: 26 Jul 1993 11:55 EDT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!ra!
cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1823@arrl.org>, jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes...

>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:
>>Well, stop taking it out of "the back pockets" of ARRL members. As quite
>>a few of us have seen, the ARRL is now connected to the Internet. Drop
>>the DIRECT connection, and save several thousand dollars a month.
>
>Well. This is the first time we've been dinged for being *too well*
>connected to the Internet. Congratulations! You win the award for
>coming up with a new complaint.
>
>In fact, we pay something in the neighborhood of \$2000 *per year* for
>our dial-up connection. *I* feel that the additional service we are
>able to provide to our members is more than worth that amount.
>
>>That's meant more of a poke in the side than anything. But it cues a
>>question, Why is the ARRL online? Why not just hookup to a mail/usenet
>>server.
>
>We used to be connected through a uucp connection to a local university.
>The unreliability of that connection is what drove us to a paid-for
>connection in the first place.
>
>>Is there a possible expansion in mind?
>
>We hope to one day provide some FTP access, as well as a better mail
>connection. We are presently waiting for our service provider to
>upgrade the capabilities at its Hartford POP. Then we may upgrade
>the connection somewhat. (No firm decision has been made, though.)
>-----
>Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
>American Radio Relay League |
>225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Yes, I would hate to see ARRL connectivity to the internet do anything but
get better. One has to be careful in ones budget but not "cheap". Strong
connectivity is the way to go and will make service more efficient. The
country is becoming connected (perhaps not as quickly as I would like but at
least continuously). I would like to see the ARRL leading and not trailing
the effort (not that its trailing now; pace seems about equal with the
rest of US).

Good work! Keep upgrading connectivity.

Erich
N3OXM

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1993 18:02:52 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>The just upgrade, Todd, and quit complaining. Focus your negative energy
>toward positive goals.

I have upgraded, and will be upgrading some more. Focus your effort on reading my posts instead of looking at my callsign. I know it's hard to get past those 1x3 N calls, but I'm sure you can do it.

My negative energy? Boy is that a good one. I'm trying to refute a bunch of bigots who are whining about the end of amateur radio, and I have the negative energy? Hahaahahahaha Thanks for morning laugh.

>If they are "table scraps," why are so many working so hard for the
>amateur community to keep them? Would you rather ALL of our bands
>are turned over to commerical interests?

I don't know why, you tell me. I'd like to see us get more allocations, but it's probably hard to justify them in many parts of the country. Here in Chicago, 220 is dead, many of the 2 meter and 70 cm repeaters are drive time only, I've never heard a signal on 902, and 1296 is nearly a ghost town. So those of you whining about the over-crowding on 2 meters and the need to save our bands, why don't *you* move to those bands?

>I guess, Todd, you feel that effort should not be required in order
>to earn an amateur ticket, correct? If this is your philosophy, then why
>not just eliminate ALL examination requirements, and just have applicants
>fill out a form and send it to to the Commission? Since FCC Form 610
>would be inadequate for this purpose, I suggest that Form 505 be used.

Say what? Find a single post of mine that advocates making the examination process easier on the applicant? (If you like, I have this group archived and will gladly retrieve all my posts.) Or is CW the only "real" way to test the "class" of an operator? Strange, I can now copy 15 WPM and my operating practices haven't changed (other than needing a paddle.)

Whether you like it or not, amateurs are a cross section of humanity. We get the good along with the bad. One's class of license or proficiency in some manual encoding technique doesn't make them any better or any worse than anyone else. There is a great deal of anecdotal evidence that demonstrates that all classes of amateurs have good operators and bad operators. Whining in rec.radio.amateur.policy isn't going to change that.

So why don't *you* put *your* negative energy into helping bad operators become good operators. Or just admit you don't like change and that you put yourself above everyone else? I can accept that. Just don't propose the rest of us should follow in your footsteps.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 26 Jul 93 16:06:09 GMT
From: gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!petra!
popovich@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>: ARRL - what's the real scoop? Please answer here rather than email - it
>: seems that inquiring minds want to know...
...
>One area I would like detailed is EXACTLY what they must do to each
>application before forwarding it to the FCC.
>
>The 610 and all the tests are filled out when they get them, as far as I can
>tell. There must be something that is not obvious that they do.
>
>What is it, And why can W5YI complete the same function so much more
>efficiently?

Given the relative performances of the VEC and the DXCC Desk lately,
it seems that either the VEC staffers have been working on DXCC, or
they've been spending a lot of their time making STRONG coffee to keep
those DXCC guys working. :-) Congratulations to the League on clearing
the DXCC backlog; now, how about clearing the license backlog? Then,
if they'd only send some of that coffee to the NYC/LI Section Manager
to get him to answer his mail more often than once every couple of
months...:-) [Is this a common problem with SCMs? Volunteering and
then deciding they don't want the job?]

It seems like priorities are being misplaced when license applications
sit around longer than award applications that require at least 100
@#\$\$%* QSL cards to be hand-checked. Sigh.
-Steve, WB3I

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 14:57:35 GMT
From: swrinda!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!

netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!
dana@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul25.001710.5168@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<5FJ97B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <pschleck.743616963@cwis>tcom
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for
Code vs.

In article <pschleck.743616963@cwis> pschleck@cwis.unomaha.edu (Paul W Schleck
KD3FU) writes:

>In <5FJ97B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>

>>kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>

>[...]

>

>>> For example, people claim that the codeless tech license was designed to
>>> increase the amateur population, and swell unused bands with new blood,
>>> thus saving our bandwidth.

>>>

>>> However, there is no incentive for people to operate on those bands. A
>>> codeless tech is, by default, going to operate on 2 meters, its the most
>>> crowded, popular band (yes, with exceptions, I'm sure).

>>>

>

>>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
>>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
>>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

>

>>Ten Forty Roger, and all those Good Numbers!

>

>> --Robert

>

>Isn't it just amazing how some hams will complain about how crowded
>"their" bands are, but won't make the switch themselves to 222, 440, and
>1296? However, these new and inexperienced no-code Tech's were expected
>to chart out new frequency territory all by themselves, frequencies that
>experienced hams won't touch yet. "Get 'em out of our way!" is the
>rallying cry.

>

>A new class of license will succeed when it doesn't "ghettoize" its
>holders onto new frequencies that don't have a strong base of usage.
>It is our responsibility to guide and Elmer new hams (What? Elmering
>those abhorrent "CB'ers" is beneath you? Poor baby!). More ham
>activity WILL cause better usage of the higher bands as soon as we
>realize that it's OUR responsibility as experienced amateurs to get off
>our butts and set the example by making the move ourselves.

Thank you, Paul. New hams will spend their money on the radio which will get them the most people to talk to. So happens that 2m is where the party is, that is where the new people will go, too.

Anyway, nothing like a code/no-code discussion to get the juices flowing. It really draws out the true colors of people.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer *
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 08:13:11 -0800
From: UB.com!pacbell.com!amdahl!grafex!ka6etb@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM>, <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
Reply-To : steveh@grafex.Cupertino.CA.US
Subject : Re: ARRL and it's members

In <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
>ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>> First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights
>> as to the ARRL's activities.

>That's not neccesarilly true. If you're a licensed amateur radio
>operator then the ARRL is helping to set policies that will ultimately
>affect you.

So does the US government. If you didn't vote, you have no bitch.

]...[

>Section Manager? Are you serious? The guy who blows off an engagement to
>speak at a club meeting, the guy who never answers his mail, the same
>guy who fails to submit section news? Sorry, but come time for him to be
>re-elected I'd like to see his butt get tossed.

Rightfully so. If he is this much of a twirp, chances are even YOU could be elected.

I have never heard the ARRL claim to represent anything other than its membership.

If you don't like the way any organization is run, carping and taking pot shots from the outside will not change it. Remember, 10 percent of any organization do 90 percent of the work. Become part of that 10 percent.

73 de KA6ETB

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1993 17:01:04 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.102709.6048@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jul22.212312.10186@Csl.Stanford.EDU>, <1993Jul24.180538.18263@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

>I've quoted the ARRL's poll results of Novice licensees.

Novices don't have full privileges, so they're not relevant. In any event, the band counts you've posted didn't include any novices, since they came from 20m.

>I've reported
>informal poll results at general interest amateur club meetings.

Several other posters, including myself, have posted to the contrary, that in fact clubs with *younger* members have a higher percentage of CW use.

> I've reported my unscientific band counts.

Again, several other posters have noted to the contrary, that CW use on 20 is on par with SSB, and is much greater than RTTY/AMTOR/PACKET.

>All say CW is a minority use among US amateurs.

Now you're shifting. In the last article, you were claiming that CW levels were the same as RTTY/AMTOR/PACKET. Now you're merely claiming less than 50% usage.

>You've yet to show any polling or surveying that says that it is the
>majority use.

I've posted several informal surveys now that indicate that usage is about the same as SSB on HF. It is thus given equal weight with SSB in the exams

for HF privileges; the ability to pass the written is certainly sufficient proof of ability to communicate in English.

>I visit lots of ham shacks every year. Even Extras seem to appreciate
>my help in solving knotty RF problems. Yet I observe fewer and fewer
>code keys each year, and many that I do see are not connected to
>radios. Instead, many are in glass cases in the amateur's personal
>antique radio collection.

Hams, especially older ones, tend to collect keys that they don't use on a day-to-day basis. I have a Nye straight key and a Vibroplex Champ that I seldom use, but my EK-1 spends an awful lot of time on the air.

Just as "strange women handing out swords is no basis for a system of government", unscientific data is hardly the basis for policy change.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #262
